

Task Force on Comparable Testing Methods for the Maryland High School Assessments

**Final Report to the
Maryland State Board of Education**

October 2006



Task Force on Comparable Testing Methods for the Maryland High School Assessments

Final Report October 2006

Executive Summary

This is the final report to the Maryland State Board of Education regarding the activities of the Task Force on Comparable Testing Methods for the Maryland High School Assessments initially convened by the State Superintendent in the fall of 2004. Experts from across the nation (American Institutes for Research, Center on Educational Policy, and representatives from several states) presented information during the first year of Task Force meetings, and provided additional resources, research reports, articles and other reference materials. Further, Maryland local school system experts in instruction and curriculum presented added information to aid the Task Force in understanding all implementation issues.

The Task Force participated in activities during year two that were designed to explore the best practices of other states as they might apply to comparable assessment for Maryland. These activities resulted in a list of proposed recommendations and associated considerations and clarifications. The eighteen proposed recommendations may serve as the basis for the design and development of a Comparable High School Assessment to be piloted in two Maryland counties as soon as possible. The report also includes a definition of a collection of evidence to further specify the recommended characteristics of the Comparable High School Assessment.

The Task Force appreciates the challenges related to the design of a Comparable High School Assessment and is gratified that the State Board of Education is willing to support continued further work on this initiative. The proposed next steps are to:

- Develop a prototype of the Comparable High School Assessment based on Task Force recommendations.

- Pilot the prototype in Maryland school systems as soon as possible.
- Ensure that the design results in a sound measure of student knowledge while being compatible with student needs for a non traditional format.
- Have a comparable High School Assessment in place no later than the 2008-2009 school year for eligible students.
- Design and implement communication plans for parents and students to ensure that the Comparable High School Assessment is accessible to all students for whom it is most appropriate.

A list of Task Force members and meeting notes are included in the report.

Task Force on Comparable Testing Methods for the Maryland High School Assessments

Final Report October 2006

Background

In March of 2004, The State Board of Education passed a resolution to endorse the State Superintendent of Schools' proposal to convene a Task Force to examine options for comparable yet non-traditional methodology to assess student skills and knowledge in the subjects of English, algebra/data analysis, government and biology. This is a report on the activities of this Task Force to date.

The resolution required the Task Force to be comprised of a broad range of stakeholders. The Task Force is chaired by Mr. Sheldon Caplis, Vice President for Institutional Advancement at UMBC. The members include representatives of Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents, Local Accountability Coordinators, Directors of Special Education, Teachers' Union, State and Local Board Members, advocates, parents, researchers and technical advisors, teachers, principals, legislators, students, and higher education.

The Task Force met for the first time on October 1, 2004, and has met a total of nine times. During year one, experts from all over the nation presented information during Task Force meetings, and provided additional resources and reading material.

The following issues were explored during year one:

Graduation requirements and the diploma – MSDE staff presented the current graduation requirements and timeline for implementation.

Data limitations – During year one of the Task Force meetings the HSA data available were not valid for decision-making for a variety of reasons. Now that the first group of students who must take and pass the tests have completed ninth grade in spring

2006, data for that cohort and those tested in earlier grades are valid. It will still be a few more years before the cumulative effects of intervention, retesting, and the composite score option reveal a more valid estimate of students needing a Comp HSA.

The different types of tests and psychometric issues – Steve Ferrara gave a series of presentations outlining the psychometric issues relative to a comparable assessment. He described the different types of tests often utilized for alternatives, their advantages and limitations.

Differences among states and lack of consensus - Keith Gayler from the Center on Education Policy presented an overview of the Center's report "State High School Exit Exams: A Maturing Reform." The presentation reviewed the different paths to a diploma used by the 25 states with exit exams. The three most common are substitute assessments, waivers and appeals, and state developed alternative tests.

In-depth study of states: Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey, and Oregon – Speakers from several states provided the Task Force with detailed information on their own systems and the consequences. New Jersey, in particular supplied lessons learned and the negative effects of some of their decisions on the credibility of their exit exam system.

Defining the students at risk - The Task Force struggled with the issue of how to define the group of students for whom the comparable assessment is intended. By definition, the assessment is intended for students who know the material at the level of performance standard defined by the HSAs but cannot demonstrate it on the HSA exam. Students receiving special education and LEP services have been identified as at risk to have difficulty demonstrating the content standards in the traditional test format. The Task Force discussed the importance of all students having access to the assessed curriculum.

Instructional issues – Carroll, Harford and Howard counties shared best practices. These districts have successfully used their data to modify instruction with significant improvement in student achievement. In addition, the Task Force discussed the

need for teachers to have knowledge of the content standards and performance targets for the courses they are teaching and the need for schools to have effective intervention programs for before, during and after students participate in HSA courses.

During year two, the Task Force explored ways to combine the best practices of other states to apply to a system that would best meet the needs of Maryland's students. A variety of activities took place.

HSA results updates – The Task Force received updates on AYP for high schools, modified appeals and assessments, and 2005 HSA results.

Eligibility requirements – The Task Force attempted to develop eligibility requirements for the Comp HSA.

Teacher involvement – The Task Force charged a subcommittee to collect information on possible assessment methods that may be able to be used with students who have difficulty demonstrating the standard in the formats used on the HSAs.

Process for schools – The Group drafted recommendations for a process for the school-based team to use to determine eligibility and content knowledge.

Adaptation of best practices – The group spent some time analyzing the feasibility of adapting the Massachusetts model to Maryland.

Defining the collection of evidence – The Task Force defined issues involving the collection of evidence needed to show that students have demonstrated the standards.

Identification of students – The Task Force designed a possible worksheet for schools to use to identify Comp HSA students.

Instructional support – There were continued discussions about students who do not know content and how they can best be served.

Proposed recommendations – The group provided input on recommendations for the design of the Comp HSA.

Simulations – The Task Force reacted to simulations of what a Comp HSA process would look like.

Meeting psychometric requirements – The Task Force recognized the challenge of meeting psychometric requirements, including sufficient evidence for reliable valid decision versus feasibility issues.

The Task Force on Comparable Testing Methods for the Maryland High School Assessments has identified a variety of issues that must be addressed, including topics in the areas of feasibility, credibility, psychometrics, eligibility and timing. Any Comp HSA must meet requirements of legal and technical sufficiency. This means that the Comp HSA must be a system of compromise to accommodate student and staff needs while maintaining the integrity of the HSA system.

There are some basic premises that the majority of the Task Force accepts. These have been summarized below. A list of the issues that must be considered by a design team follows the proposed recommendations.

For purposes of clarification, the Task Force envisions the Comp HSA as a collection of evidence. The collection of evidence is defined as tangible examples that demonstrate a student has the knowledge and skills specified in the Core Learning Goals at a level that is comparable to the level of knowledge and skills required to pass the HSA for high school that are assessed on the regular HSA. The examples can represent a variety of formats that best allow the specific student to demonstrate the performance targets, and may include performance tasks, reports, quizzes, projects, video demonstrations, etc. Please note that this list is for the purpose of providing examples and only examples of potential formats. The Design Team, which will begin their work this winter, will provide specifics on the types of student work

that will be eligible as evidence that the student has demonstrated knowledge and skills specified in the Core Learning Goals at the HSA level. It is understood that regardless of format, the work must be completed by the student independently, and the work must be transferable for evaluation and scoring at a remote location.

Proposed Recommendations

1. Maryland should have a Comp HSA.
2. Students who meet HSA graduation requirements through the Comp HSA process should receive the Maryland high school diploma.
3. The Comp HSA should not be another test; it should be a collection of evidence assembled in a way to allow the student to demonstrate his or her knowledge of the content standards.
4. Scoring must be based on a standard that is comparable to the passing standard on the HSA and that results in comparable and consistent judgments for all students.
5. MSDE will conduct a pilot for an algebra Comp HSA as soon as feasible with a few school systems. The goal is to have a Comp HSA in place no later than the 2008-2009 school year.

Process

6. Each school will convene an evaluation team. The team will first certify that the student has met minimum eligibility requirements as follows (or file a request for exemption to the minimum eligibility requirements): Students must have:
 - a. Successfully completed the course as determined by their school system.
 - b. Demonstrated knowledge (through class work, unit tests, projects, etc.) of the content standards as specified in the Core Learning Goals at the level required on the regular HSA.
 - c. Taken the specific HSA a minimum of two times.

- d. Attained an adequate performance on the HSA to demonstrate some knowledge of content standards (this requirement will be waived for students with disabilities and LEP students).
 - e. Received a recommendation from their school team and central office team. The school team will use multiple sources of achievement data to determine that a student has demonstrated the standards in the relevant content, and meets eligibility requirements.
7. **Local school systems** will convene a team at the central office to verify that a student being recommended by the school has demonstrated the standards in the relevant content and is eligible for the Comp HSA.
8. Once the student has been deemed eligible by the school and system team, an application to participate in Comp HSA will be filed with MSDE.
9. The application will be evaluated by MSDE. Once approved for participation, a Comp HSA administration window will be scheduled.
10. Students will have opportunities to appeal decisions in the Comp HSA process.

Administration and Scoring

11. Submitted evidence will cover all assessed content standards.
12. Evidence must be obtained during controlled situations (under the supervision of a teacher, the student must complete the work independently; evidence must be collected over a finite timeline.)
13. Upon completion of the collection of evidence, the principal and school system will sign off that the collection meets requirements and forward the collection to MSDE.

14. MSDE or its designated vendor will evaluate the Comp HSA. Upon submission, the collection will be evaluated for completeness and alignment to content standards, and if sufficient, scored and a decision rendered.

Additional Support

15. MSDE should make available additional samples of student work that successfully demonstrate the standards as well as scoring rubrics for use by teachers and students. Schools will be given access to a website providing examples of activities that align with assessed content standards, and sample responses that align with performance targets. The website will also include examples of activities that do not align with content standards.
16. MSDE and local school systems must do everything possible to ensure that parents and students have full access to complete information about student status on HSA requirements, opportunities for intervention, and options for meeting HSA requirements.
17. Maryland's local school systems will be pro-active in taking steps to assure that all students have access to a well-implemented curriculum aligned to HSA standards. Intervention plans must include before, during and after course options.
18. Professional development efforts should support teacher expertise in developing and evaluating instructional and assessment activities that are aligned to the content standards and performance targets. Teachers must be prepared to guide students in submitting a Comp HSA that is evaluated as complete and aligned with content standards so that they have the highest probability possible to be successful on the Comp HSA.

Design Team Considerations and Clarifications

While the Comp HSA has not been designed, some initial ideas about the process were presented in the recommendations. Additional possible considerations for the design team are:

- Clear indicators for schools to use in documenting content knowledge at the required level. This is during the eligibility phase.
- Guidance on the composition of the school team
- Evaluation of student IEPs during the initial eligibility evaluation by the school team to ensure that the annual IEP goals reflect the course content standards and performance targets.
- Modifications to the eligibility requirements.
- Guidance to assist schools to determine that a student has demonstrated the performance targets in the relevant content.
- Feasible mechanisms to allow Central Office or district level involvement to ensure standardization among schools and for accountability purposes.
- Provisions for school systems to develop an appeals process for the school and system decisions, and MSDE to develop appeals processes for MSDE decisions.
- MSDE decision about a student's participation in the Comp HSA after a careful review of data and decisions submitted by the school and school system.

- Processes to assure that collections of evidence are aligned with content standards and reflect the level of performance required on the HSA.
- Use of a pilot plan that will provide detail on how to improve timing and logistics.
- Continued emphasis on topics of opportunity to learn, teacher qualifications, and access to the curriculum.
- A designated timeframe to accomplish the collection of evidence that recognizes logistic concerns at the local level and results in a valid determination.

While the Task Force has not determined any specific Comp HSA design that will address all issues raised, the following are considerations that should be taken into account as much as possible in the design phase:

- Relationships/interface with modified assessments (pending final federal guidelines).
- Feasibility and efficiency for all involved. (Clearly, if students are to be provided alternate ways of demonstrating they have met performance standards, the most efficient models of assessment cannot be utilized. This issue will require a balance to maintain the reliability and validity of the process while adapting a process to meet student needs.)
- Provisions for needed resources.
- Providing Comp HSA opportunities as early as possible in the high school years.

Opportunities and next steps

A design team will be formed to take the recommendations and further issues raised as a result of the two years of Task Force work and begin to develop the preliminary Comp HSA for piloting.

List of Attachments

1. State Board of Education Resolution
2. Minutes
3. Membership



Nancy S. Grasmick
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, MD 21201 410-767-0100 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD

To: Members of the State Board of Education
From: Nancy S. Grasmick
Date: March 29-30, 2004
Re: Resolution to Convene a Task Force on Comparable Methods of Measuring
Student Achievement in English I, algebra/data analysis, government, and
biology

PURPOSE:

To ask the State Superintendent of Schools to convene a task force to examine comparable assessment options and other options for ascertaining student skills and knowledge in the subjects of English I, algebra/data analysis, government, and biology.

BACKGROUND/HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE:

In February 2004, the State Board granted permission to publish revised graduation regulations that would link High School Assessment performance to the Maryland High School Diploma beginning with the graduating class of 2009. Through its extensive outreach efforts, the Department has learned that some education stakeholders are concerned that students with disabilities and other students with special needs may have difficulty demonstrating their knowledge in a traditional test setting, such as with the High School Assessments. As a response to these concerns, we are proposing that the Department convene a task force that will examine comparable methods of measuring student knowledge and skills in English I, algebra/data analysis, government, and biology. This task force would examine options for comparable measurements of student knowledge and skills related to the High School Assessments and would make recommendations regarding the feasibility of implementing one or more of those options as a part of the assessment requirements for high school graduation.

ACTION:

Vote to approve a resolution that would formally ask the State Superintendent of Schools to convene a task force on comparable methods of measuring student achievement in English I, algebra/data analysis, government, and biology.

NSG:lkp

Attachment I—Proposed Resolution

Maryland State Board of Education

Resolution, March 2004

Whereas, the Maryland State Board of Education is considering a requirement that students pass the High School Assessments as a graduation requirement for the graduating class of 2009; and

Whereas, some education stakeholders are concerned that students with disabilities and other students with special challenges may have difficulty demonstrating their knowledge through a traditional setting;

Whereas, some states in the nation are exploring alternate methods of ascertaining student skills and knowledge that can be accessed by students with disabilities and other students with special challenges;

Whereas, the Maryland State Board of Education seeks to raise standards and improve achievement for all children;

Now therefore, the Maryland State Board of Education hereby requests that Nancy S. Grasmick, State Superintendent of Schools, convene a task force to examine comparable options for ascertaining student skills and knowledge in the subjects of English I, algebra/data analysis, government, and biology. Specifically, the task force should:

1. Convene by September 2004, provide periodic updates to the Board, and present a final report to the State Board by September 2007.
2. Represent a broad range of stakeholders, including state, local, and school-level educators, higher education representatives, advocates for students with special needs, parents, and students.
3. Involve state and national authorities who represent a broad range of views on this topic.
4. Examine issues related to alternate assessments, including the following questions:
 - a. What would be the requirements of a comparable measure of student achievement?
 - b. How would such a measure be implemented in Maryland?
 - c. To which students should a comparable measure be available?
 - d. How would such a comparable measure be designed to ensure acceptance by higher education and employers?
 - e. What are the estimated costs associated with comparable assessments in Maryland?
 - f. How could Maryland ensure that a comparable assessment option would be used only as an option of last resort, so that educators, parents, and students first focus on achieving success on the Maryland High School Assessments?

Meeting Notes

October 14, 2005

Attendance

The Task Force's first meeting of Year 2 was held Friday, October 14, 2005, at the Johns Hopkins Center for Technology in Columbia, Maryland. The Task Force members in attendance were: Carol Ann Baglin, Robin Church, Trish DeWitt, Steve Ferrara, Clara Floyd, Sharon Gardner, Nancy Grasmick, Gary Heath, Leslie Margolis, Debra Neubert, Patricia O'Neill, Esther Parker, Ronald Peiffer, Jim Peters, Karen Salmon, Elliott Schoen, Ann-Marie Spakowski, Joan Valentine, Jacquelyn Wilhelm, Leslie Wilson, Sheree Witt and Carolyn Wood.

Welcome, Approval of Meeting Notes

The meeting began at 9:00 a.m. Dr. Grasmick welcomed the task force members and guests and noted that there had been a few members unable to continue their participation. She thanked Mary Horsmon, Jann Barber, and Cascelia Burgess for their contributions, and introduced the new members; Ann-Marie Spakowski and Mary Ann Mathews. She also recognized Leroy Tompkins, Karen Salmon, and Kelli Nelson for their participation and support in the September Board Report on the task force activities thus far. The members introduced themselves.

Dr. Grasmick introduced Leslie Wilson who led the group through the approval of the June meeting notes, and a review of the agenda.

Overall Plan for the Year

Dr. Grasmick briefly reviewed what had been accomplished last year. The task force heard from measurement experts, learned about programs in other states, heard about processes that have not worked, discussed challenges and alternatives, and defined best and promising practices. Then she discussed how the group will begin to fine-tune our efforts, further define our target group, and possibly conduct focus groups to obtain input into content and scope of the Comp HSA. Dr. Grasmick informed the group that the timetable of work has been adjusted to allow for recommendations to go to the State Board in September of 2006. After this, MSDE staff will begin development work.

The importance of the vocabulary we use to the clarity of our explanations was emphasized. Dr. Grasmick introduced the new information about modified testing for 2% of special education students under No Child Left Behind. She explained how people are confusing this potential modified test with the Comp HSA, and how the addition of this new group may alter the target group. However, it is important for people to understand that the modified tests are for AYP purposes, and are available only to 2% of the students with IEPs. That means many students do not have access to this test. The Comp HSA would be much broader. Dr. Grasmick also explained that since MSDE has not yet received the guidance from USDE on this test, we do not know what it might look like.

Dr. Grasmick prepared the group for some decision-making later on in the meeting.

Leslie Wilson reviewed the September Board Report. The group was represented by Dr. Grasmick, Leroy Tompkins, Leslie Wilson, Carol Ann Baglin, Gary Heath, Ron Peiffer, Karen Salmon and Kelli Nelson. Leslie explained the puzzle theme that was used to illustrate the complexity of our task. The Board report contained the purpose of the task force, the stakeholder groups represented, the speakers who had presented, and some of the activities the group

accomplished last year. The Board heard about the process of gathering knowledge, discussing the issues and then coming to consensus for recommendations. Some of the state programs were reviewed, along with preliminary recommendations. Finally, the plan for Year 2 was provided. Leslie reported that the response from the Board was positive, and that they acknowledged that the assignment was a difficult one, but they had confidence in the group.

Gary Heath presented a review of the 2005 HSA results. He noted that the results included geometry, which is also used for AYP decisions, but did not yet include English. The standards for the new English 10 test will be set in November. The remaining tests do not count for AYP. Gary reported that the graduation rate hit an all-time high of 84.8 percent. He noted that geometry is the test that counts for AYP and scores improved in 20 of the 24 school systems. Algebra/data analysis counts on only for students in middle school and last year 90 percent of those students passed the HSA. Data are still difficult to interpret since school systems are still making adjustments in course sequences, and increasing numbers of seniors are taking tests years after they completed the course to meet graduation requirements to take the tests. These students tend to have poor performance. Finally, the group was apprised of the change in AYP high school mathematics test from geometry to algebra/data analysis for the 2005-2006 school year. School system responses to this information, such as changes in staffing assignments were discussed. It was also explained that MSDE had submitted a plan to USDE to include the algebra/data analysis scores of all ninth grade students, regardless of when they took the test (grade 7, 8, or 9) in the AYP calculation for a high school. Gary reviewed some of the interventions that will be available to the 1500 students statewide who did not pass algebra/data analysis but who must to graduate. Some schools will be providing significantly more interventions than others, and this is a concern.

Carol Ann Baglin provided the task force with an update on the mod-MSA appeals procedures. She discussed the review process and some areas of concern found during the processing of appeals. The appeals process was approved by USDE and the time-frame made it difficult for school systems and MSDE alike. Now that some of the processes are in place, and the students are being identified, the process should be smoother next time. Some of the issues still to be addressed are how to make sure each IEP team has the right information (the rubric) to make a decision on which students are eligible for a modified MSA and how to justify the decision. Explaining the system to parents presents a challenge, especially given the test does not yet exist. The students taking the mod-MSA are diploma-bound. Carol Ann reported the results of the elementary and middle school appeals. Of 1669 appeals, 869 total students, 2/3 were approved. Most of the denials were due to lack of documentation or participation of the parent, and no evidence of required interventions. Staff saw definite relationship between leadership and success of appeals. Schools with leaders who demand documentation and instructional intervention had successful appeals.

Mod-MSA was described as an assessment for student substantially below level but the mod-MSA must test grade level material – it cannot be an off-grade level assessment. MSDE awaits further clarification from USDE.

Ron Peiffer continued the discussion with an extension to a possible mod-HSA. This would be needed for the 2 courses that are used for AYP – English and Algebra/data analysis. Since the scope of the requirements for the mod-HSA is not available, it is not known if it will be sufficient alone to meet graduation requirements. The lack of information about what the mod-HSA might look like caused confusion for the group. The mod-HSA might be easier than the HSA, even though it is based on the same standards. Therefore, students may need supplemental evidence of some sort to meet graduation requirements. The mod-HSA cannot substitute for the Comp HSA because it is not available to all students.

Much of the group's confusion stemmed from the fact that modified tests are related to AYP and they are not related to graduation requirements. However, the future availability of modified tests may impact the target group for the Comp HSA. The group decided to focus on the Comp HSA without consideration of the mod-HSA for now. However people must understand that the mod-HSA is different from the Comp HSA.

Consensus Discussion –Eligibility Requirements

The group reviewed the reasons why they felt eligibility requirements were necessary to participate in the Comp HSA. Each member was given a handout with a list of eligibility requirements used by three other states (Massachusetts, Mississippi, and New Jersey (proposed)). They were asked to look over the lists, (as well as a list of similar requirements in "Maryland language") and propose eligibility requirements for the Comp HSA.

The discussion revealed several areas where exceptions might be warranted. For example, schools with students who are transient may have difficulty qualifying any of their students for Comp HSA if they have not been in the school long enough to have taken the test multiple times, etc. Some counties have policies that differ from others so that students may be advantaged or disadvantaged related to access. However, these are seen as potential rare exceptions, and not common enough to include in the eligibility requirements.

At the end of the meeting, the *draft* of the requirements included the following. The group will continue to work on these at the December meeting.

To be eligible to participate in the HSA, a student must have:

- Achieved the established minimum score but not the total points to meet the combined score option and/or received certification from a minimum of two content area teachers and the principal that the student's work is comparable to that of students who pass the HSA. (Audits will verify grading decisions.)
- Actively participated in academic intervention provided by the local schools system.
- Passed the course
- Taken the HSA a minimum of two times
- Met an overall attendance standard of 94% (need to specify if attendance is related to the course or year, and make a final decision on if it is tied to the state standard or not)

Carolyn Wood suggested two levels of requirements: those to qualify to enter the process, and a second set to qualify to take the Comp HSA. The second level criteria would be concerned more with documentation supporting the claim that the student has indeed mastered the content standards.

Esther Parker emphasized, and the group agreed, the importance of parent notification and information concerning the Comp HSA availability and process:

School systems are required to provide parent notification of Comp HSA options with every score report (in addition to the annual IEP report, if applicable)

Wrap-Up and Next Steps

Dr. Grasmick suggested that the task force begin to look at the concept of evidence; what does it look like? She also emphasized the need to continue to try to identify the students for whom the Comp HSA is being designed, including those in additional subgroups such as English language learners and students receiving free and reduced-priced meals. We would like to see a simulation of some of our recommendations on eligibility, evidence, and other models. Dr. Grasmick promised that the minutes would be sent out ahead of the next meeting so that members could review the eligibility requirements and prepare for December's discussion.

Next Meeting

Thursday, December 1, 2005

Location:

Meeting House in Columbia

Oakland Mills Interfaith Center

5885 Robert Oliver Place

Columbia, Maryland 21045-3786

410-730-4090 / 301-596-6458

Meeting Notes December 1, 2005

Attendance

The Task Force's second meeting of Year 2 was held Thursday, December 1, 2005, at the Meeting House in Columbia, Maryland. The Task Force members in attendance were: Carol Ann Baglin, Sheldon Caplis, Robin Church, Trish DeWitt, Sandra Erickson, Tonia Ferguson, Clara Floyd, Sharon Gardner, Nancy Grasmick, Gary Heath, Martin Kehe, Leslie Margolis, Mary Ann Mathews, Kelli Nelson, Debra Neubert, Patricia O'Neill, Ronald Peiffer, Jim Peters, Karen Salmon, Elliott Schoen, Ann-Marie Spakowski, Leroy Tompkins, Karen Whitehurst, Jacquelyn Wilhelm, Leslie Wilson, Sheree Witt and Carolyn Wood.

Welcome, Approval of Meeting Notes

The meeting began at 9:00 a.m. Mr. Caplis welcomed the task force members and guests. He introduced the Mary Ann Mathews, a new member, and Marty Kehe, from MSDE's Assessment Office who will be attending as a guest. The remaining members introduced themselves. The October meeting notes were approved, and Mr. Caplis provided an overview of the agenda.

Updates

Federal Guidelines for Modified Assessments. Gary Heath provided a brief update on the federal guidelines for the modified assessments. These still have not been released but are now expected in December. We expect to receive guidance to define which students can be considered part of the 2%, as well as what the modified assessment should look like. Gary also reported that he expects from 100 to 150 appeals from schools with students who would have taken the modified assessment this year had it been available. Dr. Grasmick mentioned that she continues to encounter people who confuse the modified assessments with the HSA and Comp HSA.

Formation of Subcommittee. Carol Ann Baglin and Leslie Wilson provided a progress report on the subcommittee being formed for the Task Force. The subcommittee will meet for the first time on December 12. Their charge is to collect information on possible assessment methods that may be able to be used with students who have difficulty demonstrating the standard in the formats used on the HSAs. The committee is composed of the following members, and may have some members added to broaden expertise if necessary:

Melissa	Larkins	Teacher	Harford
Susan	Dewlin	Teacher	Harford
Kim	Jakovics	Teacher	Anne Arundel
Mary Alice	Wyatt	Teacher	Kennedy Krieger
Derek	Glaaser	Teacher	Kennedy Krieger
Fran	Sorin	PD - SPED	MSDE
Ruth	Andrione	PD - SPED	MSDE

Lisa	Wright	SPED	MSDE
Catriona	Johnson	Parent	
Sheree	Witt	Director - SPED	Allegany
Carolyn	Wood	LAC	Harford

Consensus Discussion –Eligibility Requirements

Leslie reviewed the eligibility requirements that the group had agreed on in the October 14 meeting. She emphasized that the group can always revisit the requirements as more information and details are uncovered and the process moves along. The group also agreed to refrain from discussing exceptions and students who may need waivers in order to concentrate on requirements for all students. A waiver process can be designed to accommodate individual needs.

Leslie asked the group for some further clarification on some of the requirements. For this discussion, the group agreed to concentrate on students without extenuating circumstances, with an understanding that students with special circumstances can be handled through a waiver process. The group revisited the eligibility requirements one at a time.

Passed the course with a grade of ? The group discussed issues around which courses should be passed, especially in instances when two courses are taken to prepare for the HSA (for example Algebra I A and Algebra I B) as well as what is passing. Because of variance between systems, it was decided to reword the requirement as follows: *Successful completion of the course as determined by the school system*. The understanding will be that this means that the student has received credit, has moved on and is not repeating the course.

Taken the HSA a minimum of two times The group affirmed that students will be required to participate in some kind of intervention provided by the school after each failure to pass an HSA. Therefore, they felt this language did not need to be part of the eligibility requirements for Comp HSA. The requirement "Actively participated in academic intervention provided by the local schools system" has been removed from the list. However discussion did include recommendations that MSDE facilitate high quality intervention programs by sharing successful strategies, and continue emphasis on making sure every student has access to and an opportunity to participate in well-taught courses and intervention programs.

Met an overall attendance standard of . This requirement generated significant discussion. There were concerns that accurate data may not be available, and that different school systems had different attendance requirements. Teachers expressed concern that students need to attend class in order to learn, and that excused and unexcused absences negatively impact learning but other members said that eligibility requirements should not evaluate student motivation, and is irrelevant to demonstrating knowledge of the content. Therefore the attendance eligibility requirement was removed.

Achieved the established minimum score but not the total points to meet the combined score option and/or received certification from a minimum of two content area teachers and the principal that the student's work is comparable to that of students who pass the HSA. The teachers on the committee were supported by others who felt that no teacher would be willing to pass a student in their course yet suggest the student did not know the content well enough to demonstrate it on the HSA. Teachers also felt that they would be uncomfortable being singled out to make the judgment knowing that parents would challenge them on their decision if they did not support a Comp HSA administration.

Karen Salmon suggested that some of the components that had been removed from the eligibility requirements (such as attendance and teacher recommendation) be woven into a process that

could be used to guide schools in determining which of their students should be considered for participation in the Comp HSA. Since all of the teachers felt that they would not be comfortable refusing to recommend a student for participation, the process might involve a school-based team instead.

Leslie will convene a second team to look at possible processes modeled after the decision tree form developed for eligibility requirements. The process should require the local school and system to complete a checklist about the student and review student evidence. It is expected that this analysis should reveal previous difficulty with demonstrating knowledge on tests. The process would assist schools to identify students for whom the Comp HSA is appropriate. It would also help staff see examples of student work that meets and does not meet the standard. The goal is to provide guidance and professional development, as well as to make the process as objective as possible.

Summary Draft Eligibility Requirements for Participation in Comp HSA

Students must have:

- Successfully completed the course as determined by their school system
- Taken the HSA a minimum of two times

There was a discussion about the necessity to ensure that all students have access to specific interventions that are shown to be acceptable and effective. How do we evaluate interventions? Gary spoke about research done by the University of Maryland that can help us identify students at risk of failing HSAs, and suggested that they may also be able to evaluate intervention programs.

Task Force members reviewed the purpose of the Comp HSA, and the importance of maintaining rigor. They stressed the importance of coming to a VALID conclusion about the student who knows the content and has the skills, but cannot demonstrate this on the HSA. Those who don't "know" should not be part of the Comp HSA.

Concerns were expressed about the timing of the Comp HSA, that two administrations of the HSA requires a student to be further removed from the original course work. However, the Board has emphasized that the Comp HSA is to be used as a last resort, after failing the test AND failing to meet requirements of the composite score option. However, processes can involve collection of evidence during interventions, so preparation in the event of a Comp HSA will have begun. School systems must be advised about how to make sure they are ready to meet the requirements of the system, such as building in collections of evidence to their intervention programs. There was also a discussion about students who may not continue in school if they are faced with failure, so drop outs must be studied too. Finally, Task Force members expressed concern about the complexity of the system for students and their schools when they are facing this process for more than one of the four tests.

Feasibility Discussion: The Massachusetts Model

Leslie Wilson presented a review of the Massachusetts model. This time, she focused on the completion of a worksheet to demonstrate how the process worked. The example used was English 10, and also incorporated student grades for English 11, and possibly even English 9.

Carolyn Wood presented the perspective of a local school system, the questions and concerns they had when considering how the model might be implemented successfully in their schools. Harford pulled some sample data and completed the worksheet for a few students. Carolyn focused on the ability to assemble a cohort, which at this time seems reasonable to do, as students move from course to course without interventions. Once interventions are implemented, depending on their format, the cohort may be harder to come by. The discussion focused on the positive attributes of the HSA and how to maintain those with another system.

The validity of the score decision is of paramount importance. The Comp HSA may have to introduce other constructs, methodologies, and formats that may affect reliability and validity.

Wrap-Up and Next Steps

Dr. Grasmick summarized the discussion and told the Task Force that in February they will be hearing from the subcommittee. Based on that report, they will begin to consider what a collection of evidence may entail, begin to discuss the feasibility of these options from the measurement perspective, and consider other options.

Next Meeting

Friday, February 17, 2006

Location:

Meeting House in Columbia

Oakland Mills Interfaith Center

5885 Robert Oliver Place

Columbia, Maryland 21045-3786

410-730-4090 / 301-596-6458

Meeting Notes February 17, 2006

Attendance

The Task Force's third meeting of Year 2 was held Friday, February 17, 2006, at the Meeting House in Columbia, Maryland. The Task Force members in attendance were: Carol Ann Baglin, Sheldon Caplis, Robin Church, Trish DeWitt, Sandra Erickson, Steve Ferrara, Harry Fogle, Nancy Grasmick, Gary Heath, Leslie Margolis, Mary Ann Mathews, Patricia O'Neill, Ronald Peiffer, Jim Peters, Karen Salmon, Elliott Schoen, Ann-Marie Spakowski, Leroy Tompkins, Jacquelyn Wilhelm, Leslie Wilson, and Sheree Witt. In addition, Stephanie Moltz represented Jon Cardin, and Damon Felton represented Clara Floyd. Mary Baskar also attended as the replacement for Tonia Ferguson.

Welcome, Approval of Meeting Notes

The meeting began at 9:00 a.m. Mr. Caplis welcomed the Task Force members and they introduced themselves. The December meeting notes were approved, and Mr. Caplis provided an overview of the agenda.

Updates

Subcommittee Report. Carol Ann Baglin and Leslie Wilson provided a report on the subcommittee that met on December 12. Their charge was to collect information on possible assessment methods that may be able to be used with students who have difficulty demonstrating the standard in the formats used on the HSAs. No real break-through information was collected. The group re-visited many of the concerns already discussed by the Task Force. Their main focus was on students who have not learned the material and what to do for them.

There were three main themes: (1) the problems of students with limited long term recall, (2) the apparent issue that grade assigned by teachers are based on many non-academic components of performance, therefore teachers have no expectation that there is or should be a relationship between course performance and HSA performance, and (3) reading and writing issues for low achievers. We may need to consider modifications to the administration of the HSA for students without disabilities.

The committee's second task was to suggest how to identify students in schools who should be taking Comp HSA, distinguishing between students who know the material and those who do not. These ideas have been incorporated into the worksheet presented later in the meeting.

Presentation and Discussion – Collection of Evidence Issues

Gary Heath presented some initial ideas and issues surrounding the design of a collection of evidence piece that would also meet psychometric requirements for a comparable HSA.

Content coverage: a hand-out illustrated the content subtests on each test. Discussion centered on our inability to set reliable, valid passing scores to give subtest scores meaning and keep students from having to provide a collection of evidence for all content areas and not just those they could not demonstrate they knew. As it stands now, samples must come from each subtest category. The exact number of samples has not yet been determined, but they will be required per test and per subtest. Task Force members wanted to know if someone at the school would have the option to select a sample of all of a student's work and submit only the best. It is too early to address that now.

"Item" alignment: To assure that all pieces of a collection are aligned with the content standards, Gary suggested that MSDE would provide sample types of activities, items, interview protocols, and products via website. It is important for everyone to understand that the collection is not another test; we use the label "item" in a much broader sense in this context.

When and where: The next part of the discussion focused on when and where samples could be collected. To maximize the probability that work submitted was completed independently by the student, no work completed at home will be allowed in the collection. Most likely, the collection will need to occur under somewhat standardized conditions, yet not as restricted as a regular test administration. It will also need to be completed during some type of window, as teachers as well as Task Force members have expressed concern with gathering evidence over extended time periods. Task force members cautioned against using the Alt-MSA model because it is too cumbersome.

The group expressed frustration that we have still not been able to talk to or see a student for whom this alternative is for – optimally we would design it to meet their needs. What keeps students from passing? Discussion moved back to eligibility and the issues around implementation so the meeting moved on to the next topic on the agenda.

Presentation and Discussion – School Determination of Initial Criteria

Leslie Wilson reviewed the results of a study completed for Washington State on alternate routes to the high school diploma. There were four basic approaches: substitute tests (which Maryland is working on currently) classroom evidence, GPA-based and criteria-based. No state is currently using classroom evidence as it is not seen as having sufficient credibility for high-stakes decisions. The states using GPA-based approaches use them as a part of a criteria-based system (i.e. GPA or grades are not enough alone). Leslie also did a review of advantages and disadvantages of using grades as criteria.

Next the Task Force looked at the proposed worksheet to be used by schools to help them determine students who would likely be successful on the Comp HSA. There were concerns expressed about requiring completion of all of the data suggested for consideration by the school team. There was also some confusion about whether the student work the school was being asked to consider would be the same as the work evaluated as part of the Comp HSA. The two would be different, as the purpose of the work evaluated by the school would be to allow staff to see if examples of student work meet or do not meet the standard. These do not have to meet the same parameters that student work considered for the Comp HSA will have to meet (verified as independently completed by the student alone, completed in a given timeframe, etc.)

Again, discussion moved to students who do not know the material. The group discussed the importance of distinguishing between two groups of students:

- 1) Those who have not had sufficient opportunity to learn or access to a well taught curriculum with differentiated instruction and
- 2) Those not able to demonstrate knowledge on the HSA

The Task Force is charged with focusing on the second group.

Dr Grasmick agreed and said that looking at the performance of an entire class provides a different perspective. Huge cohorts are not passing that should have. They are victims because they didn't receive effective instruction.

Elliott Schoen mentioned that litigation is usually focused on denying diplomas because of access to effective instruction issues (opportunity) not test issues.

MSDE must impress upon Superintendents that it is their responsibility to make sure all students have appropriate instruction to get them to standard. They should look at their data – if a high percentage of students in a classroom are not passing, the issue is probably not due to students not being able to demonstrate the standards on the HSA. Therefore the Comp HSA would not help them. School systems must provide targeted professional development.

It was acknowledged that Boards do not want to deny diplomas. The graduation requirements will be a huge burden because the "ticket" is being withheld. The Task Force agreed that MSDE may need to err on the side of a few false positives.

The Task Force expressed a desire to maintain high standards and a diploma with credibility. They cautioned against designing an assessment to let students through high school and suggested using this opportunity to improve instruction resulting in better education for students. Most students are failing because they don't know the material, and it is difficult to get teachers to acknowledge the problems, even with data.

Wrap-Up and Next Steps

Dr. Grasmick summarized the discussion and told the Task Force that she had heard recommendations for a three-step process:

1. Eligibility (page one of handout)
2. Pre-screening/collection of evidence by school (process to help schools make decisions)
3. Evaluation by MSDE and final decision

The schools' process should be streamlined as much as possible. Dr. Grasmick also spoke about the need to address the issue of students not having access to effective instruction. She requested that the Task Force e-mail Leslie with any additional recommendations for eligibility requirements.

Next Meeting

Friday, April 21, 2006

Location:

Meeting House in Columbia

Oakland Mills Interfaith Center

5885 Robert Oliver Place

Columbia, Maryland 21045-3786

410-730-4090 / 301-596-6458

Meeting Notes April 21, 2006

Attendance

The Task Force's fourth meeting of Year 2 was held Friday, April 21, 2006, at the Meeting House in Columbia, Maryland. The Task Force members in attendance were: Carol Ann Baglin, Mary Baskar, Sheldon Caplis, Robin Church, Trish DeWitt, Sandra Erickson, Steve Ferrara, Harry Fogle, Sharon Gardner, Nancy Grasmick, Gary Heath, Leslie Margolis, Mary Ann Mathews, Kelli Nelson, Debra Neubert, Patricia O'Neill, Ronald Peiffer, Karen Salmon, Ann-Marie Spakowski, Leroy Tompkins, Karen Whitehurst, Jacquelyn Wilhelm, Leslie Wilson, Sheree Witt and Carolyn Wood. In addition, Liz Kameen represented Elliott Schoen, Damon Felton represented Clara Floyd and Mary Jo Neil represented Esther Parker.

Welcome, approval of meeting notes, and context for the day

The meeting began at 9:00 a.m. Mr. Caplis welcomed the Task Force members.

The February meeting notes were approved, and Mr. Caplis turned the meeting over to Dr. Grasmick. Dr. Grasmick discussed two options for the group; to complete their work during this meeting or finish up in June. She reviewed the process the group had been working on which included responsibilities for:

- schools, to establish student eligibility
- Central Office to affirm decisions for the system,
- The state, to review for consistency and standardization.

Dr. Grasmick mentioned that it will be important to distinguish between the legitimate pool of students for the Comp HSA and those who do not know the content standards to avoid opening a floodgate. She reminded the group that the waivers for the 2% group had followed a similar pattern of school, system, and state involvement, and that only a fraction of waivers submitted were found to be legitimate.

She explained that the group would be looking at a simulation of the process as it has been developed thus far. Dr. Grasmick introduced Leslie to review the recommendations the group had been working with thus far.

Recommendations Activity

Each Task Force member received a listing of the recommendations and a worksheet on which they were to record their individual degree of agreement with each. They took 15 minutes for their individual review, recording concerns, issues and questions of their worksheet. For the next 15 minutes they broke into three groups and discussed five of the recommendations in detail for presentation to the entire group (Group 1 reviewed recommendations 1-5, Group 2 reviewed 6-10 and Group 3 reviewed 10a-10e.) Finally the groups reported out. Tallies of the individual input as well as the summaries of group feedback are attached in the Results Tally Sheet.

The group agreed that two recommendations should be added, one to continue the group to oversee the development of the process and the other to add a well-defined appeals process at each level of the process (school, system and state.)

Simulations

Leslie provided an overview of the process, which generated significant discussion. There was confusion around the use of the word "recommendation" for participation in the Comp HSA from school and system. A few members did not think the school system should provide any level of input except that the process was followed. Others disagreed and thought the school system should be accountable for the quality and quantity of the students that the schools were submitting for participation.

It was clear that the Task Force members have concerns about the process and some of the unintended consequences of Task Force decisions. For example, concern was expressed that students and schools should not have to go through this cumbersome process unless they have a good chance of success. The challenge is to make the criteria clear enough that good decisions are made by schools and systems. We need to develop a process to identify the Comp HSA student. If this process were reliable and valid, ultimately students could take the Comp HSA in place of the HSA, without having to wait to have failures on the HSA. The Comp HSA may still take effort and staff time, but it would be for very few students. Other concerns were expressed that the system review may allow the system to overturn a school's recommendation that a student participate in the Comp HSA.

The timeline is another area of concern, ranging from students having to wait too late in their high school years to have access to the Comp HSA, to the turn-around time for evaluation of the Comp HSA itself. There are issues relative to remediation and its scheduling and delivery. How will continued involvement with the HSA testing after course completion impact future course completion? Systems must be careful in planning interventions that provide an advantage to the student – including early completion of each HSA course to allow time for additional instruction and re-taking tests.

In the absence of an example, there continues to be confusion about what the collection of evidence entails. The Task Force continues to struggle to find language that conveys that this is not another paper and pencil test, although it is an assessment because it results in a final judgment of student achievement of the content standards. Evidence can be collected in a variety of ways, depending on student needs, but the student does need to demonstrate attainment of the standards. Therefore if criteria call for students to organize ideas and present a persuasive argument, they must be able to do that, although it may not be required that it be hand-written by the student as on the HSA.

There was also concern about issues related to the collection of evidence that would meet the parameters of acceptable measurement practice. Task Force members were concerned the collection of evidence would be like the Alt-MSA which is labor and time intensive for staff. However they were not supportive of having to maintain collections of classroom evidence for all students in the event they became candidates for the Comp HSA later.

The Task Force looked briefly at the first simulation which included an overview of a students and completed forms for the Comp HSA process. This again brought up the challenges of identifying the student for whom the Comp HSA is intended. It was brought up that not every student who fails the HSA should have passed. A good number do not know the material. Some example data were provided of large discrepancies in course pass rates and test pass rates. This suggests that a number of students are passing HSA assessed courses that probably have not attained the standards.

This prompted another discussion of grades, the fact that they are the only predictor we currently have, but schools have little else on which to base their screening decisions. We had originally suggested that the Massachusetts model be used as eligibility to take the Comp HSA (in Massachusetts the model IS the Comp HSA), so we will put this back on the table for consideration. Limitations of the Massachusetts model are that it is not designed for end of course tests, and some students will not have an adequate cohort group.

The group agreed that this is a complex issue and that the “devil is in the details”. They have requested that they continue to oversee the process as it is designed since it is difficult to agree with a process that they have not seen.

Wrap-Up and Next Steps

Dr. Grasmick summarized the discussion and thanked the group for their work on this highly technical and complex issue. She charged Leslie to compile the recommendations worksheets, re-do the recommendations according to the discussion, and e-mail them to members. She will also include some previous information about the Massachusetts model.

Finally, Dr. Grasmick reiterated her desire to avoid a New Jersey model that would open up the Comp HSA for too many students.

Next Meeting

Thursday, September 21, 2006

Location:

Johns Hopkins University Columbia Center

6740 Alexander Bell Drive

410-290-1777

Meeting Notes September 21, 2006

Attendance

The Task Force met on Thursday, September 21, 2006, at the JHU Center in Columbia, Maryland. The Task Force members in attendance were: Carol Ann Baglin, Sheldon Caplis, Jon Cardin, Robin Church, Trish DeWitt, Sandra Erickson, Steve Ferrara, Harry Fogle, Keith Gayler, Nancy Grasmick, Gary Heath, , Mary Ann Mathews, Kelli Nelson, Mary Jo Neil, Debra Neubert, Ronald Peiffer, Karen Salmon, Elliott Schoen, Ann-Marie Spakowski, Karen Whitehurst, Leslie Wilson, Sheree Witt and Carolyn Wood. Damon Felton represented Clara Floyd and Allysa Fieo represented Leslie Margolis.

Welcome and approval of meeting notes

The meeting began at 9:30 a.m. Mr. Caplis welcomed the Task Force members and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

2006 HSA Results

Gary Heath reviewed the HSA results from 2006 with a particular emphasis on the fact that this is the first year we have data for students who must pass the HSAs in order to graduate. All students tested in Grades 9 and below must pass, and their results represented significant improvement over previous years. Gary also discussed some related activities, such as the Middle School Task Force that has been formed, and changes in course structure such as two-course sequence algebra.

Context for the Day

Gary turned the meeting over to Dr. Grasmick. Dr. Grasmick welcomed the group and thanked them for their patience in waiting to get back together. She explained that although it may be difficult to come to total consensus, we must try to finalize some recommendations to take to the Board. She also encouraged Task Force members to attend the Board presentation. Dr. Grasmick requested that Dr. Salmon take the recommendations to the Superintendents in October, prior to the Board meeting. These steps are essential so that we can move forward to a design phase – sending our recommendations and issues to a design team that will attempt to balance psychometric and technical feasibility requirements with feasibility issues.

The resulting Comp HSA will be piloted with two school systems: Howard and Talbot. Dr. Grasmick assured the group that several of them would be involved in the design team and others would be involved in the K-12 Assessment committee.

Dr. Grasmick encouraged the group to review the document from the last meeting and do what they could to come to consensus. She then turned the discussion over to Leslie.

Review of Task Force Report

Leslie reviewed the steps we had taken to get to the report that was disseminated earlier in the week. In April, the Task force provided individual input to a variety of recommendations, recorded their issues and concerns, and then had group discussions about the recommendations. The purpose of this meeting is to come to final agreement about the recommendations. The report provides a summary of Task Force activities for years one and two. Then the recommendations are presented. Finally, is a list of issues for the design team to consider. Leslie encouraged the Task Force to focus on the recommendations and let the design time focus on the issues we identified.

The group began by looking at recommendations 1-5. Number 5 has been reworded to emphasize that the standards must be comparable, assuring the rigor of the HSA, and consistent over time. The group felt that there were some inconsistencies between numbers 3, 4, and 12 and that we need clearer language. They also felt we could merge number 3 with number 7, as three really refers to determining eligibility.

The discussion over what the Comp HSA "item" looks like, given it is not another test continued. The group suggested that perhaps instead of having a bank of items/activities/projects that teachers could choose from to construct a collection of evidence, that exemplars that illustrate evidence that is aligned with core learning goals, and examples that are not aligned. The intent would be to serve as staff development role for teachers who were helping students assemble Comp HSA collections of evidence. Leslie expressed concern for students whose teachers were unprepared to help them develop collections of evidence that would meet with success on the Comp HSA.

Steve suggested that we use a common definition for collection of evidence and add it to the paper at the beginning. The Task Force agreed this was a good idea.

There was some discussion about the definition of the minimum score – who it should apply to and what it might be. It was suggested that the design team be charged with making the final recommendation, as the pilot will allow for the opportunity to empirically investigate the issue further.

The group also expressed concern that a pilot in 2008 was too late for students in the class of 2009. However the eligibility requirements require that students have taken and failed the HSA twice, so it may not be feasible to have students to pilot with (especially in English, government and biology when courses are later) any earlier. Dr. Grasmick expressed confidence that the Board will allow this project to move along as quickly as possible. She identified Talbot and Howard Counties to work on the pilot.

The Task Force identified their commitment to recommending that clear information be available to parents in order to minimize misunderstanding of the process, requirements and options available to students. An additional recommendation for this will be added.

Comp HSA Design Team

Gary described the plan for assembling a design team to flesh out the details of the Comp HSA. As with previous design teams, this one will have local representation from those who have served as HSA item writers, scorers, teachers, Core Learning Goal writers, measurement experts, etc. They will take the recommendations of the Task Force and complete the details of "item" design (relative to collection of evidence), scoring, and process for a Comp HSA to be piloted. He emphasized the requirements that the COMP HSA will have to meet, such as psychometric and legal standards, comparability, and peer review (federal).

Wrap-Up and Next Steps

Dr. Grasmick summarized the plan to take the report to the board in October, and invited all Task Force members to attend.

Finally, Dr. Grasmick thanked the group for their expertise, involvement, time commitment, willingness to travel to meetings and care for the students in Maryland schools.

Task Force Membership

Chair

Mr. Sheldon Caplis

Members

Ms. Leslie Margolis
Ms. Esther Parker
Ms. Mary Jo Neill
Ms. Clara Floyd
Ms. Patricia O'Neill
Dr. Karen Salmon
Dr. Charles Ecker
Dr. Harry Fogle
Ms. Joan Valentine
Dr. Leroy Tompkins
Dr. Carolyn Wood
Mrs. Jacquelyn Wilhelm
Ms. Sandra Erickson
Dr. Barbara Wheeler
Dr. Robin Church
Dr. Cascelia Burgess
Ms. Sheree Witt
Ms. Kelli Nelson

Ms. Tonia Ferguson
Ms. Mary Baskar
Ms. Ann-Marie Spakowski
Ms. Mary Ann Mathews
Mr. Joseph Warfield
Ms. Mary Horsmon
Dr. Steve Ferrara
Ms. Aditi Srivastav
Mr. Jim Peters
Ms. Jann Barber
Ms. Sharon Gardner
Ms. Karen Whitehurst
Ms. Trish DeWitt
Mr. Kalman R. "Buzzy" Hettleman
Senator Patrick J. Hogan
Dr. Maria Torres-Queral
Dr. Debra Neubert
Rep. Jon S. Cardin

Research / Consultants

Mr. Matthew Gandal
Mr. John F. "Jack" Jennings
Dr. Robert Lissitz

Maryland State Department of Education

Dr. Nancy Grasmick
Dr. Leslie Wilson
Dr. Ronald Peiffer
Dr. Carol Ann Baglin
Mr. Gary Heath
Ms. Valerie Cloutier
Mr. Elliott Schoen